

1 The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was *not* written
2 for publication and is *not* binding precedent of the Board

3
4 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

5
6
7 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
8 AND INTERFERENCES
9

10
11 *Ex parte* KARE CHRISTIANSEN and HUGIN HANSEN
12

13
14 Appeal 2006-3215
15 Application 09/097,383
16 Technology Center 3700
17

18
19 Decided: September 13, 2007
20

21
22 *Before:* MURRIEL E. CRAWFORD, JENNIFER D. BAHR, and JOSEPH
23 A. FISCHETTI, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

24
25 CRAWFORD, *Administrative Patent Judge.*
26

27
28 DECISION ON APPEAL
29

30 STATEMENT OF CASE

31 Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 (2002) from a final rejection
32 of claims 1-3, 8, 10-15, 18, and 23-25. We have jurisdiction under 35
33 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).

34 Appellants invented an apparatus for pulsed light for treatment of a
35 human or animal body (Specification 1).

36 Claim 1 under appeal reads as follows: